



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

grown on fertilized land. *Bell v. Reynolds*, 78 Ala., 511. Profits from future fruit grown are too remote and conjectural. *Rhodes v. Baird*, 16 Ohio St., 573. However, a line of New York cases hold that for a diminished output or total failure of a crop, the measure of damages is the difference between the actual crop and an average crop of the same kind. *Passinger v. Thorburn*, 34 N. Y., 634; *Van Wyck v. Allen*, 69 N. Y., 61, but the weight of authority is *contra*. *Gresham v. Taylor*, 51 Ala., 505; *Richardson v. Northrup*, 66 Barb., 85; *Jones v. George*, 56 Tex., 149. Where the landlord failed to supply water to irrigate the field, he was liable in damages for the diminished crop yield. *Raymold Rice Milling Co. v. Landford Bros.*, 32 Tex. Cic. App., 401. And the principal case is further upheld very clearly in *Brown v. Hadley*, 43 Kan., 267, where the rule is laid down that dairymen or cattlemen can with reasonable certainty estimate their future returns from feeding cattle.

LANDLORD AND TENANT—INJURIES—CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE.—*ROHRBACHER v. GILLIG*, 98 N. E., 733 (N. Y.).—*Held*, that a landlord, having provided a well lighted stairway in a building leased to several tenants, owned no duty to third persons, who call to see a tenant on business, to keep a well-lighted hallway leading to a freight elevator shaft.

The general rule is that the owner of a tenement is under no legal obligation to keep lights in hallways of the tenement, and the absence of lights does not prove negligence. *Halpin v. Townsend*, 107 N. Y., 608; *Bears v. Ambler*, 9 Pa., 193. Other courts have held that where the landlord retains complete control over the premises he is liable for injuries of a third person received therein. *Coupe v. Platt*, 172 Mass., 458; *Jennings v. VanSchaick*, 108 N. Y., 530. However, the burden of proof is upon the plaintiff to show negligence on part of the landlord, and an absence of contributory negligence on his own part. *Moore v. Goedel*, 34 N. Y., 527. The rule is otherwise if the hall is so unusual or peculiar as to render artificial lights essential for reasonable safety. *Marwedel v. Cook*, 154 Mass., 235; *Borgan v. Hanan*, 66 N. Y. S., 1066. But if the hallway and stairway are in all respects inherently safe and convenient, the owner owes no duty to keep them lighted. *Capen v. Hall*, 21 R. I., 364. Nor is he liable to third persons for injuries caused by defective conditions of premises, unless he had knowledge or notice, actual or constructive thereof. *Borman v. Sandgren*, 37 Ill. App., 160; *Ploen v. Staff*, 9 Mo. App., 309; *Rice v. Trustees of Boston Univ.*, 191 Mass., 30. Where the guest of a tenant has the right of recovery such right is identical with that of the tenant. *Davis v. Pacific Power Co.*, 107 Cal., 563; *Fisher v. Jausen*, 128 Ill., 549; *Moore v. Steljes*, 69 Fed. Rep., 518. And he can have no greater claim than the tenant would have had under same circumstances. *Jordan v. Sullivan*, 181 Mass., 348; *Clyne v. Helmes*, N. J. L., 358; *Dyer v. Robinson*, 110 Fed., 99.

LEGAL TENDER—EJECTMENT OF PASSENGER—LIABILITY OF CARRIER—*CINCINNATI NORTHERN TRACTION CO. v. ROSNAGLE*, 95 N. E., 884 (OHIO).—